

INFO-HAMS Digest

Mon, 11 Dec 89

Volume 89 : Issue 100

Today's Topics:

10 meter mobile
ARRL (2 msgs)
ARRL Letter 01-Dec-89
info-hams bulletin
Modifiying radios for out of band operation
QSL Address for UK3A
rec.ham-radio is out of control (2 msgs)
Telephone Interference
Wall Street...cordless...; now cellular encryption (2 msgs)
Wrong forum, but, hey...

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 16:11:21 EST

From: bill gunshannon <702WFG%SCRVMSYS.BITNET@CORNELLC.cit.cornell.edu>

Subject: 10 meter mobile

Does anyone know if there is an UP/DOWN microphone available for the Ranger line of 10 meter mobiles?? It is real hard to tune in SSB while mobiling (and probably pretty dangerous too. :-))
Anybody got any info??

KB3YV

bill gunshannon
702WFG@SCRVMSYS.BITNET

Date: 11 Dec 89 09:01:43 GMT

From: mailrus!accuvax.nwu.edu!tank!cps3xx!usenet@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Usenet file owner)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <5744@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <608@ryn.esg.dec.com> taber@pstjtt.enet.dec.com writes:

>By the way -- the league is its members. It does what its membership
>wants. Every person who leaves the league because they disagree with
>some group (code .vs. no-code, radio-mod idiots, etc.) is actively
>supporting the other side. The way to change things is to stay and
>fight. Changes are made by do-ers, not whiners.

Not entirely true, Pat. I can't think of a more "do-ing" group of amateur radio operators than the microwave enthusiasts. However, us

microwavers lost out in QST publications recently, because of financial pressures. The bigwigs looked for someplace to cut, and picked us as an easy target. Maybe they figured that this was a way to cut spending and piss-off the least amount of people. Several microwave operators wrote letters to several league officials (I was one of them), and all they got back was form letters. Fighting has proved fruitless, and so I'll move on to greener pastures. I no longer support the ARRL.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: 11 Dec 89 20:35:15 GMT
From: cica!ctrsol!samsung!usc!orion.oac.uci.edu!uci-ics!turner@tut.cis.ohio-
state.edu (Clark Turner)
Subject: ARRL
Message-ID: <25840F84.22887@paris.ics.uci.edu>

In article <608@ryn.esg.dec.com> taber@pstjtt.enet.dec.com writes:
>In article <24896@ubvax.UB.Com>, hardwick@ubvax.UB.Com (Bob Hardwick) writes...
>>
>>I got the following off of a packet BBS the other day
>>[mindless threats by a disturbed individual regarding radio mods]
>>
>>If this is what the ARRL is doing with our dues money then
>>the ARRL has just lost a member.
>
>The following is from the December 1989 "Moved and Seconded" section of
>QST:
>
>"9.1 The Executive Committee reviewed a report prepared by the Field
>.....
>the Amateur Auxiliary; and that a repetition of this conduct will be
>grounds for immediate removal from office."
>
>By the way -- the league is its members. It does what its membership
>>wants. Every person who leaves the league because they disagree with
>some group (code .vs. no-code, radio-mod idiots, etc.) is actively
>supporting the other side. The way to change things is to stay and
>fight. Changes are made by do-ers, not whiners.
>
> >>>==>PStJTT
> Patrick St. Joseph Teahan Taber
>
>Mail address: ahhhhh, you don't want to send me mail....

Patrick:

I agree with you in principle, but it appears that you have never approached the monolithic organization with an idea that is new or different....such ideas are not usually met with open approval - even if obviously meritworthy. There are many hams who deserve all our respect who leave the League for good reasons and do not deserve the title of "whiners" - as they can do the job that the League can't or won't elsewhere.

You mention that the ARRL IS its members. I find, in my experience, that this is naive, but well intentioned of course. The organization does not have to pay attention to its individual members, and can even occasionally get around the majority...though the majority, if energetic, can make the thing move. Then again, even a majority does not guarantee wisdom (and even if the ARRL was completely responsive, it might not work for amateur radio in the long run - many of us hams are well intentioned but ill informed or just intransigent in our opinions.)

The way to change things is to stay and fight? Good for you! This can, of course, help to change the organization (and take all your time, tapping into other areas of your life with no guaranteed return for your efforts, it can embitter you as you meet the opposing forces and learn their motives...) Some find it better to NOT be a party member in the one-party system of the ARRL, and contribute to amateur radio through the infinite ways that are available (just being good, decent hams; ensuring good publicity for amateur radio in general; adding their opinions to the crowd when the FCC is in session, etc.)

While I generally applaud the ARRL as a solid organization with all good intentions respecting amateur radio, and I even participate in some of the activities they organize...I choose not to be a member because I see my part in amateur radio singularly missing from the actions and words of the League. I play my part elsewhere, and I believe that it is just as important and more efficacious for me to do so individually and as a non-League member of the community.

Respectfully,

Clark, WA3JPG
turner@ics.uci.edu

Date: 11 Dec 89 08:18:42 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!mailrus!accuvax.nwu.edu!tank!cps3xx!
usenet@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Usenet file owner)
Subject: ARRL Letter 01-Dec-89
Message-ID: <5743@cps3xx.UUCP>

>Mr. McNamara says that possible
>alternatives range from FCC rule making that would ban all third party
>traffic on amateur frequencies to rules that would designate certain
>frequencies where only third party communications could be conducted.

Boy - both of these options sound pretty stupid!

If third party traffic was not allowed on amateur radio, public service would become a thing of the past. Sure, the rules could be waved in case of emergency, but what about all the non-emergency public service that occurs? All public service involves 3rd party traffic, by definition.

If there were certain frequencies where only third party communications were prohibited, then how would the appropriate hams make their initial contact. (Ok, the law could be written such that the main purpose in using a set of frequencies is third party traffic.) What would this mean for repeater sub-bands, and autopatches? What about on HF, where the subbands are segregated by license type? What if there wasn't a significant amount of 3rd party traffic: load-balancing could become a problem.

In the past, the amateur frequencies have only been separated into mandated, enforcable, bandplans by license class and signal modulation type. Separating up the bands by signal content seems to me to be just a bit too much government control. Does the 1st ammendment come into play here? Can the federal government tell me that I can say anything I want, EXCEPT in some circumstances? (I'm not talking about slander here, so don't criticize me with that tact.) I think the FCC might be opening up a can of worms that they are not aware of; this can of worms could turn out to be disastrous for amateur radio.

flames to /dev/null; constructive criticism and conversation welcomed.

In the rare case that original ideas	Kenneth J. Hendrickson	N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible.	Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI	48825
Internet: kjh@usc.edu	UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh	

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 15:21:12 EST
From: Clark Fishman (FSF) <cfishman@PICA.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: info-hams bulletin
Message-ID: <8912111521.aa08150@AC4.PICA.ARMY.MIL>

I have not received any issues in about a week. Maybe I got disconnected. Please reconnect. 73 Clark Fishman

(cfishman@pica.army.mil)

Tnx

Date: 11 Dec 89 07:47:03 GMT
From: mailrus!accuvax.nwu.edu!tank!cps3xx!usenet@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Usenet
file owner)
Subject: Modifiying radios for out of band operation
Message-ID: <5742@cps3xx.UUCP>

In article <7425@cbnewsm.ATT.COM> rma@mhgki.ATT.COM writes:
>[stuff deleted]
>Can you see the potential for chaos? A better solution
>would be a nationwide emergency frequency (similar to the FAA scheme) open to
>all for use and monitored by all police/fire/emergency services.
>[stuff deleted]
> 73, Bob Atkins.

Bob:

Don't we already have a nationwide emergency frequency? Isn't
it 27.065 MHz, CB channel 9?

Note: I don't use CB; I have never used CB; I will never use CB; I
don't listen to CB. The above is only an editorial comment, not an
endorsement.

In the rare case that original ideas Kenneth J. Hendrickson N8DGN
are found here, I am responsible. Owen W328, E. Lansing, MI 48825
Internet: kjh@usc.edu UUCP: ...!uunet!usc!pollux!kjh

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 12:56:37 -0800
From: soomre@books.enet.dec.com (NKS2-2/H2 DTN 291-9975 11-Dec-1989 1452)
Subject: QSL Address for UK3A
Message-ID: <8912112056.AA14156@decwrl.dec.com>

I have seen notes mentioning requests for US1GB QSL cards go to
UK3A. Who is UK3A ? Its not in any of the latest callbooks or
the recent GO List.

.....
ed N1BFF

Date: 11 Dec 89 19:07:35 GMT
From: att!cbnewsj!ralph@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Ralph Brandi)
Subject: rec.ham-radio is out of control
Message-ID: <2783@cbnewsj.ATT.COM>

In article <30500318@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu> phil@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu writes:

>Why do you think that the monitoring stuff should be in rec.radio.shortwave?
>There are those who do one or the other and don't want anything to do with
>the one they weren't interested in. By the NAME of the group, shortwave
>listening goes there, but monitoring is still left out in the cold, and most
>people still expect it to be HERE. So until someone gets off their other
>end and sets up rec.radio.monitor I will continue to expect it to be here.

Well, actually, during the discussion period for r.r.sw, and during the call for votes, it was made clear that VHF and higher (scanners, TVRO, etc.) was part of the charter for the group. The name was chosen (after much debate) because we couldn't come up with another one that accurately described everything that was covered (rec.radio.hobby? Nah, sounds like kit building or something. rec.radio.monitor? Sounds like a group just for scanners. rec.radio.listen? Sounds like discussions of top-40 radio.) Name notwithstanding, scanner enthusiasts have been part of the target group for r.r.sw since day 1.

--

Ralph Brandi ralph@lzfme.att.com att!lzfme!ralph

Work flows toward the competent until they are submerged.

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 14:04:22 CST
From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)
Subject: rec.ham-radio is out of control
Message-ID: <8912112129.AA02078@ti.com>

Lets keep SWL, monitoring, and other discussions. It keeps the BB from getting boring; and it lets us know what kind of people we have around.

thanks,
Dube Todd, N5PDK

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 15:16:05 CST
From: Rick Troth <TROTH@ricevm1.rice.edu>

Subject: Telephone Interference
Message-ID: <8912112126.AA12464@brazos.rice.edu>

On 11 Dec 89 17:45:30 GMT Rich Moran said:

>I've used this same circuit very successfully on the line inputs to
>telephones. It always seems to work.
>
>The caps used across the tip/ring line, however, need to be rated for
>at least 250V. ...
>
>The FCC requires, in fact, that telephone input protection devices
>can't kick in below 250V to avoid clipping peaks during ring.
>
>73,
>Rich KZ9K

You know, the 90VAC ring will cause a neon bulb to glow.
Once I put a neon bulb, less the usual dropping resistor, across the
line and had Dad ring the number. Each time, immediately after the
first ring, he'd get a dial tone, as if I had picked up the phone and
then hung up FAST.

The nearest I could figure: the bulb would get 90V or more and
start to glow (and thus conduct; the neon ionized), the switch (at
the telco office) would sense the conduction as an off-hook condition
and connect stopping the ring, the bulb stopped conducting opening the
circuit again, the switch saw the open circuit and "hung up".

Rick Troth <TROTH@RICEVM1.RICE.EDU> ----- Rice ONCS VM Systems Support

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 14:00:50 CST
From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)
Subject: Wall Street...cordless...; now cellular encryption
Message-ID: <8912112022.AA01348@ti.com>

The notion of encryption of public communications is an oxymoron. In order
for encryption to afford security, the method must be known only to a few
who have a need to know; then it should be changed at irregular intervals.
When the system is changed, all users would have to change. Now project this
to the general population, where both the system in use and the effective times
are more-or-less common knowledge due to widespread dissemination. Forget
encrypted cellular systems, except as just another sales point for the industry.
encrypted cellular systems, except as just another sales point for the
industry. There will be enough folks who will be willing to divulge the system/
timing

details to make it entirely useless. Like "Quality is Job One", it will be just another slogan.

Regards,
Dube Todd

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 14:00:50 CST
From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)
Subject: Wall Street...cordless...; now cellular encryption
Message-ID: <8912112022.AA01350@ti.com>

The notion of encryption of public communications is an oxymoron. In order for encryption to afford security, the method must be known only to a few who have a need to know; then it should be changed at irregular intervals. When the system is changed, all users would have to change. Now project this to the general population, where both the system in use and the effective times are more-or-less common knowledge due to widespread dissemination. Forget encrypted cellular systems, except as just another sales point for the industry. encrypted cellular systems, except as just another sales point for the industry. There will be enough folks who will be willing to divulge the system/timing details to make it entirely useless. Like "Quality is Job One", it will be just another slogan.

Regards,
Dube Todd

Date: 11 Dec 89 19:02:39 GMT
From: sun-barr!newstop!texsun!pollux!ti-csl!hoenig@lll-winken.llnl.gov (Mike Hoenig)
Subject: Wrong forum, but, hey...
Message-ID: <101791@ti-csl.csc.ti.com>

As the subject line says: I know this is the wrong forum for what I'm trying to accomplish, but you know how it goes, folks.

Some years back (7, plus 4 days, to be exact), I left the service of Uncle Sam's Animal Farm behind. During my tenure, I had the opportunity to make several friends (as well as a few enemies). One of the former, I met while stationed at what is now Onizuka AFS. His name is MSGT Don Jackson, USAF(Ret). The last contact I had with Don was when he went to work for Martin-Marietta in the Los Angeles area. I've noticed a few names here from L.A., including David Kensiski. I was wondering if it might be possible to locate Don by way of this

forum, much as we might try via the airwaves. OK, so it isn't really
Amateur Radio related. Shoot me. <grin> I did warn you.

de N5LTL
Mike Hoenig

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1004
